



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/943,404

08/30/2001

Douglas L. Sorensen

042390.P11172

8246

45209 7590 04/15/2008

INTEL/BLAKELY
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/943,404	Applicant(s) SORENSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner MYLINH TRAN	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration have been entered and carefully considered. However, arguments regarding rejections under 35.U.S.C 103 to claims 1-18 have not been found to be persuasive. Therefore, these claims are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed (09/10/07).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. [US.2003/0037055] in view of Banning et al. [US. 5,421,008].

As per claims 1 and 11, Cheng et al. teach a computer implemented method and corresponding system for explaining search logic and results, comprising the steps/means: presenting a presentation model capable of explaining how a system model relates a plurality of search input elements to a comparison element (figure 5, page 5, 0067-0069), the presentation model comprising at least one of a method for the computer system to conceptualize the search logic and a method for the computer system to conceptualize the search logic and a method for a user to conceptualize the search logic (page 4, 0056-0058), wherein the system model comprising a collection of data and control concepts capable of being used to determine a first search result; presenting how the system model is related to the comparison element; and presenting a relative importance of the system model in comparison with the comparison element (page 6, 0081-0084).

Cheng et al. do not disclose the comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements and generating a user interface that explains to a user a computer system's search logic and results. However, Banning teaches comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements at col. 29, lines 10-25; and the user interface explaining the computer

system's search logic and result (figure 10, column 2, lines 30-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 2, Cheng et al. teach presenting how parts of the system model being related to parts of the comparison element (page 2, 0022). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 3, Cheng et al. teach presenting a relative importance of the parts of the system model in comparison with parts of the comparison element (page 7, 0098). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 4, Cheng teaches presenting how parts of each of the plurality of search input elements are related to parts of the system model (page 7, 0095).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 5, Cheng teaches presenting a relative importance of the parts of the plurality of search input elements in comparison with the parts of the system model (page 4, 0058). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 6, Cheng et al. teach saving the system model (page 8, 0109). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claims 7 and 13, Cheng et al. teach: receiving a modification to the plurality of search input elements to create a new plurality of search input elements (page 4, 0051-0053); determining at least a second search result (page 4, 0055-0059); updating the system model to create a new system model incorporating the modification (page 6, 0081); Cheng et al. do not disclose presenting how the new system model is related to the comparison element; and presenting a new relative importance of the new system model in comparison with the comparison element. However, Banning teaches comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements at col. 29, lines 10-25; and the user interface explaining the computer system's search logic and result (figure 10, column 2, lines 30-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 8, Cheng teaches a storage device coupled to the processor (page 6, 0075); a search component storable on the storage device and executable on the processor to accept at least one search input element and determine a first search result using a system model and a presentation component storable on the storage device (page 6, 0083) and executable on the processor to create a presentation of a presentation model relating the system model to one of the first search result (page 7, 0096-0098).

Cheng et al. do not disclose the comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements and generating a user interface that explains to a user a computer system's search logic and results. However, Banning teaches comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements at col. 29, lines 10-25; and the user interface explaining the computer system's search logic and result (figure 10, column 2, lines 30-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 9, Cheng teaches: the processor being a server (page 6, 0075); and further wherein the processor being capable of receiving the at least one search input element from a client (page 6, 0083). Cheng et al. do not disclose the comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements and generating a user interface that explains to a user a computer system's search logic and results. However, Banning teaches comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements at col. 29, lines 10-25; and the user interface explaining the computer system's search logic and result (figure 10, column 2, lines 30-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in

Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 12, Cheng et al. do not disclose presenting a contribution of parts of the comparison element to parts of the system model and presenting a relative importance of parts of the system model in comparison with parts of the comparison element.

However, Banning teaches comparison element is selected from a list of potential comparison elements at col. 29, lines 10-25; and the user interface explaining the computer system's search logic and result (figure 10, column 2, lines 30-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Banning of selecting comparison element from a list of potential comparison elements in Cheng's system since it would have made it easier and faster to create comparison element.

As per claim 16, Cheng teaches the application being a database application (page 2, 0018).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Banning and further in view of Hsu (US 6,374,079).

As per claim 10, Cheng in view of Banning do not disclose the processor being capable of communicating in a wireless Internet environment. Hsu teaches a processor is adapted as an entry point onto network for wireless users having

wireless Internet services (col. 7, line 63 - col. 8, line 8). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Hsu of processor capable of communicating in a wireless Internet environment in the Cheng and Banning system since it would be convenient and easy to adapt to a wireless Internet technology.

Claims 14, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Banning and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

As per claims 14, 15, 17, and 18, Cheng in view of Banning do not disclose his explaining search queries are applied to electronic mail, Internet search engine, e-commerce, and document management. These features are taught by applicant's admitted prior art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to modify the Cheng and Banning system for explaining search queries to implement in electronic mail, Internet search engine, e-commerce, and document management systems since it would have presented an overview of search presentation to users.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has argued that the references do not teach or suggest "generating a user interface that explains to a user the machine's search logic and results". However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's attention is directed

to column 2, lines 36-45 cited "The processor accesses data structures to determine the current status of a database and displays the logical relationships of the information stored in the database graphically. A user employs a pointing device to select and change portions of the database and its logical relationships via the graphical user interface." The step of "displaying the logical relationships of the information stored in the database graphically." is considered as the step of explaining to the user computer system's search logic and results. Further, Banning et al. teach the user computer system's search logic and results by comprising information for the computer to perform a query of a relational database using SQL being visually structured into related objects with the text representing the objects of interest and the graphical representation of these objects depicting the relationships that exist or are of interest to the requester.

It is noted that the applicant does not specify the invention in the claimed language. The claimed language itself "computer system's search logic and results" is a broad term. It is not clearly enough to describe the present specification.

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are

not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179